



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE SOURCES OF JOSEPHUS FOR THE HISTORY OF SYRIA

(In "*Antiquities*," XII, 3—XIII, 14).

WHEN Josephus was about to write the history of the Jews under the reign of the Seleucides, he was not only obliged to look for information dealing with the events of his own native country, but also to have regard to such sources as had the general affairs of the Syrian empire for their object. For the fortunes of the little states of Asia anterior were intimately connected with the conditions of the land of the Seleucides, and the Judaeans also felt the effects of the uninterrupted contentions for the throne and of the troubles of war. Palestine had no rest, from the death of Alexander the Great, when the struggle about his heritage commenced between his generals, till the decisive victories of John Hyrcanus (128 before the common Era) which brought about the independence of the Jews. If Josephus intended to make his exposition of the particularly Jewish history clear and intelligible, it was indispensable for him to relate, however briefly, the incidents of the Syrian empire, in as far as they affected, and exercised an influence on, Judaea. It was therefore to be expected that he would give a complete narrative of everything that had happened in Judaea since Alexander's death, and give, in the course of his report, a short account of the wars of the *Diadochi*, inasmuch as they influenced the configuration of the conditions of Jerusalem. Yet, he produces for the whole period up to Antiochus the Great only very scanty reports, and hardly any of such a nature, that even the skeleton of

a history could be formed from them ; and, in the place of reliable traditions, he communicates extracts from Hellenistic writings of doubtful value<sup>1</sup>. It is only in chapter XII, 3 that the *Antiquities* again contain matter of historical value, mainly obtained by Josephus by an ample use of the first book of the Maccabees, and continued to any length only as long as the same work gave assistance. It is remarkable that the information about the events in Syria, drawn from the works of pagan Greek historians, also commences at the same passage of the *Antiquities*, where the extracts from the first book of the Maccabaeans begin, and they continue in every chapter up to XIII, 14, so that we may conjecture at the outset, that the authority, from which Josephus drew, commenced its narrative with Antiochus the Great. It must further be observed that the relation between the Jewish source and the Greek in several portions of the *Antiquities* is different, inasmuch as the communication of Syrian events, which are rarely, and then very briefly only, given in those cases where the first book of the Maccabees offers ample material, becomes more loquacious and more frequent in XIII, 7, 1, where the Jewish narrative is at an end<sup>2</sup>. The scantier the descriptions of the affairs of Judaea become in book XIII, the more copious and ample does the narrative, drawn from non-Jewish sources, become.

The latter, so valuable for the history of Syria, were thoroughly investigated by Bloch<sup>3</sup>, Nussbaum<sup>4</sup>, and Destinon<sup>5</sup>. The two first scholars have come to the conclusion that Josephus drew these particulars from Polybius and Posidonius, who had written on the history of Syria. Destinon, on the other hand, is of opinion that

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften*, IV, 350 ; Schürer, I, 138 sqq. ; Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Destinon, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*, pp. 40 sqq., 46 ; Niese, in *Hermes*, XI, 468.

<sup>3</sup> *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*.

<sup>4</sup> *Observationes in Flavii Josephi Antiquitatum libros XII, 3—XIII, 14*.

<sup>5</sup> l. c.

Josephus, although acquainted with the works of these historians, had not made any direct use of them, but had found them blended already with Jewish sources, to which he added only a few abstracts, for the most part without value, from Jewish legendary works. As to the authors that are quoted by Josephus by name, Bloch and Destimon prove that he knew them from their works, from which he took the passages produced by him. Without, for the present, deciding in favour of the one or the other opinion, I will take for my starting-point some separate citations, and arrive at a general judgment on the source of Josephus' information on Syria, after we have been led by them to a recognition of their constituent parts.

1. *Nicholas of Damascus in "Antiquities,"* XIII, 8, 4.

In this chapter, Josephus describes the relation between John Hyrcanus and the Seleucid king Antiochus VII Sidetes, after the conclusion of the peace between them, and relates that Hyrcanus accompanied Antiochus, whose ally he was, in his war with the Parthians, and supported him with his troops. He then adds: *μάρτυς δὲ τούτων ἡμῖν ἐστὶν καὶ Νικόλαος ὁ Δαμασκηνὸς οὕτως ἱστορῶν*, "my evidence is here also Nicholas of Damascus." These words would imply that Josephus had yet another source for his narrative of the participation of Hyrcanus in the campaign against the Parthians, besides Nicholas, since he quotes the latter only as evidence for that which had been told already. But Bloch<sup>1</sup> and Destimon<sup>2</sup> have shown that in reference to Josephus' allegations the course taken by him probably consisted in this. Josephus read the reports of the historians, and copied, for his use, those which he thought to be of service for his own work. In writing the *Antiquities* he utilized the notes he had made in such a way, that, wherever they agreed with his principal source, he added them with a mere mention of the author. But when this

<sup>1</sup> *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*, p. 99.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 59.

was not the case, he first added the contents of his note in his own words, and then confirmed by a verbal citation that which was apparently the information of his principal source, but in reality his own abstract from the contents. This was also found to be the case by Niese<sup>1</sup>, when he investigated the documents and decrees inserted by Josephus in the *Antiquities*, and he observes on this point: "On noticing the mode in which they are inserted, it appears that Josephus, when occupied with inserting them, had nothing to assist him, except the documents themselves; that he could take the leading points, the chronological and material indications of their arrangement, from themselves, in order to connect them with his principal source. . . . For even the introductions, by means of which he connects the documents with that which precedes them, are not independent information, but have themselves been derived from the documents, with little trouble." It is thus that the sentence dealing with Hyrcanus's expedition in the Parthian war, which precedes the quotation from Nicholas, has also been taken from this historian, Josephus first excerpting the contents from Nicholas' description, and then verbally reproducing the passage itself.

From this it follows that Nicholas had written the history of Antiochus VII Sidetes; for it is impossible to assume that he had only described the war of that king against the Parthians. Besides, if Josephus had not taken this passage out of the principal work of Nicholas, but out of some special book on the subject, he would have said so. We can even prove that Nicholas had written the whole history of the Seleucidæan empire, for Josephus quotes him in his narrative on the plundering of the temple in Jerusalem by Antiochus IV Epiphanes (*Contra Apionem*, II, 7), and in the information he gives about the victory of Ptolemy Lathyrus over Alexander Jannæus (*Antiquities*, XIII, 12, 6). It is true, these two pieces of information might have occurred in a history of the Jews written by

<sup>1</sup> *Hermes*, XI, 472.

Nicholas, for they deal with events which had an immediate effect upon the Jews. Nevertheless, although Josephus quotes Nicholas several times, and even goes into particulars about them, yet he does not say anywhere that the latter had written a history of the Jews under the rule of the Seleucides. He only mentions his great, general history<sup>1</sup>, and to this he constantly refers.

In the passage just quoted, *Antiquities*, XIII, 12, 6, in which the cruel treatment of the Jews on the part of Ptolemy Lathyrus is described, Josephus' observation follows, that Strabo and Nicholas mentioned these inhuman proceedings in the same way. This again is followed by the sentence: "He also took Ptolemais by force, as we explained already in another place." It is not distinctly said which is the subject of this sentence, and the last words not only presuppose the narrative that precedes them, but they are also nothing but the continuation and a portion of the narrative of Ptolemy Lathyrus. We need only strike out Josephus' observation about Strabo and Nicholas, as not belonging to the narrative, and we have the abstract he made from his source, before our eyes. But as Josephus adds, that the two historians mentioned narrated the event in the same way as he did, without saying from whom he had taken his own narrative, it is clear to me that he had taken it either from Strabo or from Nicholas. We shall see later on that it belongs to the latter author, but we can already here notice which of the two was really his authority for this passage. For if we compare here the quotation from Nicholas about the part John Hyrcanus took in the Parthian war—which we took for our point of issue—with the description about Ptolemy Lathyrus, we shall find that in both cases the description as given by his informant is followed by an observation of Josephus about the passage quoted; after this the narrative of the Parthian war proceeds, just as if there had been no interruption. It is only necessary to disregard Josephus'

<sup>1</sup> Vide Schürer, I, 43.

note, in order to gain the original shape in which the information of Nicholas lay before him. But this similarity only proves that Josephus, in *Antiquities*, XIII, 8, 4, proceeded with the information before him, in the same way as in XIII, 12, 6; but it does not prove the identity of the authors of both passages. But, on comparing both descriptions, another remarkable peculiarity strikes us, which is also common to both. They both conclude their report with the words, *ὥς καὶ πρότερον ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται, ὥς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις φανερόν πεποιήκαμεν* respectively, and since, as we shall show directly, this remark belongs to Josephus' source, the peculiarity just observed proves that both passages belong to one and the same source. Now, in *Antiquities*, XIII, 8, 4, in the narrative of the Parthian war Nicholas alone is named as the authority; therefore XIII, 12, 6 must also have been taken from the same author only. We shall presently notice Strabo's relation to the *Antiquities*, and also the mode in which he is quoted by the side of Nicholas.

We have thus come to the conclusion that Josephus took his short description of the Parthian war under Antiochus VII Sidetes entirely from Nicholas of Damascus, without making use of any other sources. This is contradicted by the terms of his allegation, *μάρτυς δὲ τούτων ἡμῶν ἐστὶν καὶ Νικόλαος ὁ Δαμασκηνός*, which, as we said above, seems to imply that Nicholas was just mentioned by the way, but that somebody else was his chief authority<sup>1</sup>. But the expression loses its strength when we remember that the passage quoted from Nicholas plainly shows that this historian in his description of the events of Syrian history, in which of course the conditions of the Syrian empire formed the centre of interest, mentioned the Jews only by the way. He mentions the high priest and prince of Judaea only as *Ἰρκανὸς ὁ Ἰουδαῖος*<sup>2</sup>; he considers it

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Bloch, p. 92; Destinon, p. 53.

<sup>2</sup> Just as also Strabo, in Josephus, *Antiquities*, XV, 1, 1, mentions Antigonus the king as *Ἀντίγονον τὸν Ἰουδαίων*.

unnecessary to give the name of the festival, on account of Hyrcanus asking the King Antiochus for a rest of two days, although it required only one word to do so, and Nicholas could have easily made it out from the season of the year in which the expedition took place. He did not trouble because it was of no interest to the readers of a history of Syria. But it was one of the principal objects of Josephus in writing his history, to show the Romans and Greeks that the Jews had taken part in the great campaigns of other nations; in this case, in the war of the Seleucides with the Parthians. If he had embodied in his work Nicholas' information without any comment, his pagan readers would have carelessly passed over the passage which it particularly concerned him to be noticed. He was therefore obliged to point it out specially, and this he did by singling out, and placing at the beginning of Nicholas' narrative, the one sentence only about Hyrcan's participation in the campaign, and following it up by a verbatim reproduction of the whole passage in which Nicholas mentioned the event only incidentally<sup>1</sup>. Thus, notwithstanding the term *μάχης*, the whole section, which contains nothing except the prefatory table of contents, the quotation from Nicholas, and the description of the Parthian war, was taken from Nicholas alone, and Josephus used no other source for this, because, probably, no other historical work treating on this expedition had mentioned Hyrcanus's presence and co-operation<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Whenever no reference to the warlike achievements of the Jews could be found in Nicholas, Josephus looked for other authorities, whom he quotes then after the same fashion. Thus, in *Antiquities*, XIV, 8, 3, he refers to the participation of Hyrcan II in Caesar's campaign in Egypt, and names Strabo the Cappadocian as a witness for information solely drawn from him. Vide below.

<sup>2</sup> Schürer also observes, I, 64: "Josephus took all his matter from Nicholas and Strabo, but, in some passages which are of importance to him, he mentions them as saying *the same* as he." I will only add, that he quotes his principal source, Nicholas, also when he wants to controvert his statement, and gives a different opinion. Thus we find that in *Antiquities*, XIV, 1, 3, he copies Nicholas verbatim without naming him; but at the beginning of the account he names him in order to say



2. *The reference formula* ὡς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδηλώκαμεν<sup>1</sup>.

We have already noticed that the two passages examined by us, *Antiquities*, XIII, 8, 4 and 12, 6, conclude with a reference to another account of the events described here. Apparently it is Josephus himself who refers to his own work in the first person of the verb. But we know from his own accounts the extent of his achievements as an author, and know that he never wrote about the liberation of Demetrius II Nicator from the captivity of the Parthians, nor about the conquest of Ptolemais by Ptolemy Lathyrus. The reference belongs therefore, as was already convincingly shown by Destinon<sup>2</sup>, to the source from which Josephus had copied the whole account. Now we have found that, in both cases, Nicholas has been the source, so that the concluding sentence, referring to another book, was also his property. Since Nicholas had written the whole history of the Syrian empire, this result is not only not improbable in itself, but is of such a nature that we should have arrived at it also by other considerations. For it is obvious that Josephus, when proceeding to write the Jewish history during the rule of the Seleucides, in the first instance made use of the work of the very man, who dealt with the same period of the Syrian empire, and who was readiest at hand.

But in order to place the inferences drawn from only two passages on a firm basis, it is necessary to show that the remaining references of Josephus, of which there is

that Nicholas described Herod's father, Antipater, as the descendant of one of the first Jews who had returned from Babylonia; that he had done so for the purpose of flattering Herod, whereas Antipater had been in reality an Idumean by birth. In the same way he quotes Nicholas in *Antiquities*, XVI, 7, 1, only with the object of reproaching him, that out of regard for Herod he had omitted every mention of the plundering of David's grave; although it is certain from other passages that Josephus had taken his whole account of Herod from Nicholas. Cf. also Destinon, p. 94.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften*, IV, 372.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*, p. 27.

a great number, may also allude to the work of Nicholas. In the first instance we meet with them several times in the form of references to a history of Syria. In *Antiquities*, XII, 5, 2 we are told that the Romans had ordered Antiochus IV Epiphanes out of Egypt in the midst of his victories; this information is accompanied by Josephus with the remark: *καθὼς ἤδη πού καὶ πρότερον ἐν ἄλλοις δεδηλώκαμεν*. Now we know that Nicholas had described the pollution of the temple of Jerusalem, committed by Antiochus during his retreat from Egypt, and that Josephus had made use of this one account only; consequently, this reference also tallies with our assumption<sup>1</sup>.

In XIII, 10, 1 he describes the reign and death of Antiochus V Eupator, and concludes the sketch of the character of Demetrius I, his successor, with the words: *καθὼς ἤδη πού καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδηλώκαμεν*. In XIII, 2, 4 he puts the phrase, *ὥς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδηλώκαμεν*, after the description of the struggle between Demetrius I and Alexander Balas and the death of the former. In XIII, 4, 6 we find, *καθὼς ἐν ἄλλοις δεδηλώκαμεν* after the mention of the death of Ammonius; in XIII, 4, 8, *καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδηλώκαμεν* after the recapitulation of the reign of Alexander Balas;

<sup>1</sup> Nussbaum and Bloch, as already mentioned above, referred these accounts to Polybius. Against this Destignon rightly observes, p. 48, that all that can be proved is this, that there is nothing to contradict the possibility of its having been taken from Polybius, but it was not proved also that it had been taken from that author. Bloch, p. 97, quotes as a proof the fact that Polybius had made Antiochus' expedition to Egypt the subject of an exhaustive description, and has dealt with Antiochus in detail. Against this I only observe that exactly the same can be shown to have been the case with Nicholas, whilst other circumstances point to the use Josephus had made of this author. Nor does the fact, which Bloch considers to be so convincing, oppose our assumption. For Josephus says that Antiochus was ordered by the Romans to leave Egypt after he had already possession of the country, which shows that this account intends to emphasize the interference of the Romans, which, according to Bloch, corresponds with the tendency of Polybius' description. Against this we observe, that Nicholas cannot have omitted either to mention in his history the interference of the Romans, even if he had felt no particular interest for the Romans and their universal supremacy.

and ὥς καὶ πρότερον ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται after a short statement about the liberation of Demetrius II from Parthian captivity. Nothing confirms our argumentation more than the last passage, which was also the one from which we started. Even in the absence of all information, we may suppose that the historian, who describes the liberation of Demetrius II from captivity, and the events that led up to it, had also mentioned that he was taken captive. The latter incident is, in fact, mentioned in *Antiquities*, XIII, 5, 11 with the words, αὐτὸς ζῶν ἐλήφθη καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται; and in connexion with the same sentence occurring in the section in which the liberation of Demetrius is described, and Nicholas of Damascus expressly named as the authority. Besides these passages the following also must be noted: XIII, 10, 1, ὥς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις ἱστορήκαμεν, after the remark that Cleopatra became the wife of two kings of Syria who were brothers; and XIII, 13, 4, καθὼς ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται, in reference to the reign of Demetrius and Philippus; all which passages can refer to Nicholas' history of Syria.

But our proposition can be proved not only from the Syrian history, but also from other parts of the *Antiquities*. In X, 2, 2 Josephus says, δηλώσω δὲ περὶ τούτων ἐν ἑτέροις, that he would speak in another place of the annihilation of the Assyrian empire by the Medes; but he did not fulfil his promise. Nor can all through his work a single passage be found in which he might have endeavoured to carry out his intention, and not one of his narratives would have been better suited for such information than this very one, in which he promises to give further explanations. Now, we possess numerous and lengthy fragments of Nicholas that bear reference to the most ancient history of the Assyrians, Medes, Greeks, Lydians, and Persians, up to the time of Croesus and Cyrus<sup>1</sup>; and they testify that he had dealt with the history of the Assyrian kingdom till its downfall. Josephus' reference alludes, therefore, to the information

<sup>1</sup> Vide Schürer, I, 43.

contained in a later book of Nicholas, and the allegation belongs to this historian. This would show that other references by Josephus, in respect to the period and the nations that were dealt with by Nicholas, were also taken over from this author; for instance, καθὼς ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται in *Antiquities*, XI, 8, 1, in respect to Philip and Alexander of Macedonia.

This result is still more completely confirmed by statements in respect to Roman history. We find in *Antiquities*, XIV, 6, 2, where Gabinius' expedition to Egypt is mentioned, the phrase καὶ ταῦτα μὲν καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται; on the other hand, Josephus himself mentions (XIV, 6, 4) that Nicholas and Strabo had treated Gabinius' campaigns against Judaea in the same way; therefore, as in the previously mentioned cases, the allegation belongs to the former author. In *Antiquities*, XIV, 7, 3 Josephus mentions the death of Crassus in the war against the Parthians, and, in concluding his account, says: ὥς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται; similarly, in respect to the battle of Philippi in XIV, 11, 1, τοῦτο μὲν οὖν καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται, and of the death of Cassius in the battle against the Parthians in XIV, 7, 3, ὥς καὶ ὑπ' ἄλλων δεδήλωται.

Lastly, the fact that all these allegations belong to Nicholas is proved by another consideration. Destinon, on examining the sources of the fourteenth book, says, in reference to XIV, 1, 1-6, 4, as follows<sup>1</sup>: "The account concludes with the words: 'Nicholas of Damascus and Strabo the Cappadocian agreed completely on the campaigns of Pompey and Gabinius against the Jews.'" To this, I think, we may add: and the identical account of both has been reproduced by me. Accordingly, the greater part of the contents of this chapter would have to be attributed to Nicholas and Strabo conjointly. For the expression περὶ δὲ τῆς Πομπηίου καὶ Γαβινίου στρατείας comprises all that is narrated there with the exception of XIV, 1, and 2, 1. But nobody will want to separate this chapter from the subsequent narrative except

<sup>1</sup> *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*, p. 102.

the account of the fate of the pious Onias. Besides this interpolation Josephus can have altered his source but little<sup>1</sup>. Now within the chapter, convincingly proved to form one whole, in XIV, 6, 2, in the same passage where Josephus says that Nicholas and Strabo had described the campaigns of Pompey and Gabinius, the remark occurs: "Gabinius changed his plan, in order to march to Egypt and reinstall Ptolemy on the throne, *καὶ ταῦτα μὲν καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται*." It must further be mentioned that Gabinius' enterprise, which was only one part of the whole expedition, could certainly not have been written by anybody except by one who had dealt with all the campaigns; and it is beyond doubt that the whole, allegation and all, was taken from Nicholas. Destinon (p. 103) says of *Antiquities*, XIV, 7, 1-11, 4: "This section is altogether without any external testimony as to its origin, we are therefore altogether confined to internal evidence. The latter shows beyond doubt that Nicholas was the source." Now in XIV, 7, 3 the following account occurs: "As to Cassius, he arranged everything as he thought fit, then he marched into the land of the Parthians, but there he perished with his whole army, *ὥς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται*;" and again: "Cassius started soon after and marched towards the Euphrates, to meet there the attacks of the enemies, *ὥς καὶ ὑπ' ἄλλων δεδήλωται*." If a whole section in all its parts is recognized as the property of Nicholas, must not the references to passages it contains, and for which there is no reason whatever why they should be separated from the whole description, also belong to the same author? Destinon (p. 106) expresses the following opinion on XIV, 11, 4-16, 4: "The narrative is uniformly of a piece . . . and I do not doubt but that the piece has been taken over from Nicholas in its entirety." Now in XIV, 12, 2 we meet with the communication: "In the meanwhile Cassius, *ὥς καὶ παρ' ἄλλοις δεδήλωται*, had been defeated at Philippi by Antonius and Caesar." There is

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Schürer, I, 44.

nothing to justify us in striking out that clause from the whole sentence; therefore, it belongs to Nicholas. Thus we have recognized the reference formula in four passages of that portion of the *Antiquities*, of which it is beyond doubt that it was copied from Nicholas; and this, in conjunction with the results gained above, sufficiently confirms the assumption that Josephus' references originated in the history of Nicholas, and direct the reader to certain portions of that work. But this further proves that the thorough and comprehensive information about events in the Syrian kingdom, as contained in Josephus' *Antiquities*, XII—XIV, was taken, as far as the reference formulae go, from the history of Nicholas, which was based on primary and reliable sources.

Before concluding this inquiry, I should like to draw attention to the change in the form of the references, which makes it uncertain whether Nicholas of Damascus quotes only his own work, or whether he alludes also to information given by other authors. Destinon, who has paid particular attention to these reference formulae, attributes to the passive form of the sentence a different meaning to the active. He says (p. 27) that the author, when using the first person *δεδηλώκαμεν*, thinks of his own work, but, when using the term *δεδήλωται*, alludes to any book dealing with the events narrated in that section. Taking his issue from this distinction which is based upon the form of the verb, he arrives at a conclusion in reference to these formulae which is as artificial as it is improbable. He says: "Gabinus' expedition to Egypt for the instalment of Ptolemy Auletes, the destruction of the Roman army in Parthia under Crassus, Cassius' war with the Parthians, Caesar's assassination, the battle of Philippi, do not belong to a detailed description of the history of the Jewish people; a simple mention of these events would suffice; if the reader wanted to know more, he could turn for information to some work on Roman history. Those words in the fourteenth book of the *Antiquities* are meant

as a warning to that effect. It is different with the preceding books. There the formulae are used promiscuously. Sections, entirely similar as to their contents, terminated at one time with one, and at another time with the other formula, and—which is of particular importance—a section ending with one of the two formulae is later continued without any gap. They do not, therefore, serve here to direct the reader to a more detailed description, but mainly to form a transition from one source to another, from the description of foreign events to those that are specially Jewish. It would be unsuitable to treat them there in a different manner.” As Destinon admits the identity of significance of both reference formulae in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth books of the *Antiquities*, it is incomprehensible how he could be content with such a violent distinction. How unjustifiable it is will appear on comparing the few passages of the *Wars of the Jews*, in which the reference formulae occur, with the corresponding passages of the *Antiquities*<sup>1</sup>. We read in *Wars*, I, 8, 9: “Cassius returned to the Euphrates in order to prevent the Parthians from crossing it, *περὶ ὧν ἐν ἐτέροις ἐροῦμεν*,” where Josephus’ prototype promises, in the first person, to give a more detailed description of the campaign; in *Antiquities*, XIV, 7, 3 we find, in connexion with the same information, *ὥς καὶ ὑπ’ ἄλλων δεδήλωται*<sup>2</sup>, which shows that no distinction can be made between the active and the passive form. *Wars*, I, 1, 8 we read: “Crassus crossed the Euphrates and perished with his whole army, *περὶ ὧν οὐ νῦν καιρὸς λέγειν* ;” but—thus we may safely complete the phrase—later on; in *Antiquities*, XIV, 7, 3 we read, in the same sense, *ὥς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται*, in the passive. Thus both phrases refer, without any distinction, to the work of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Destinon, *Die Quellen*, p. 19, n. 1; Niese, in *Hermes*, XI, 469; Schürer, I, 71.

<sup>2</sup> This form of reference is certainly an alteration by Josephus of the stereotyped *ἐν ἄλλοις*, just as *παρ’ ἄλλοις* in XIV, 11, 1 and 12, 2, as shown by the parallel passage. He seems here to have become conscious of the unsuitability of *ἐν ἄλλοις* in his book.

Nicholas. I rather think that a distinction in accordance with the change of tense ought to be observed, and that the perfect *δεδηλώκαμεν* points to the description of the event which precedes the passage, but that the present tense of the passive refers to later information in a passage to come. This is shown in the first instance by a comparison of *Antiquities*, XIV, 7, 3, *ὡς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δελήλωται*, with *Wars*, I, 8, 8, *περὶ ὧν οὐ νῦν καιρὸς λέγειν*; *Antiquities*, XIV, 7, 3, *ὡς καὶ ὑπ' ἄλλων δελήλωται*, and *Wars*, I, 8, 9, *περὶ ὧν ἐν ἑτέροις ἐροῦμεν*; and secondly, by the circumstance also, that whenever the passive form does not refer to a following, but to a previous description, the word *πρότερον* is added, e. g. *Antiquities*, XIII, 8, 4<sup>1</sup>.

### 3. *The historical work of Nicholas of Damascus.*

If the fact is established that Josephus took his information about the kingdom of the Seleucides from the exhaustive work of Nicholas, and that the references occurring in the copied passages are those by which the latter directs his readers to different sections of his book, it follows that Nicholas had dealt with many incidents in two different passages. Is this really so, and is this at all probable? It is only necessary to take Polybius for an example, and to turn to any passage, no matter which, to see that he refers the reader to some other section, in order to avoid repeating what he had described before, and so as not to be under the necessity of anticipating what he intended to narrate in a more fitting place. We must assume Nicholas to have used the same method, even if there were no trace left to show it. When we further have regard to the distinction alluded to above in the meaning

<sup>1</sup> Wherever the future tense of the verb is used, we recognize at once Josephus' hand, who had not observed this intentional use of the tenses; thus *δηλώσομεν* in *Antiquities*, III, 4, 2; VI, 13, 10; *Contra Apionem*, I, 14, all which passages are Josephus' property. In the same manner does *ἐν τούτοις* for *ἐν ἄλλοις* in IX, 7, 5 betray the authorship of Josephus.



of the reference formulae, namely, that they point at one time to preceding matter and at another time to information to come, we recognize the mode of description common to ancient works, and which it was not first necessary to establish. But we have also gained some hints as to the sequence of the different descriptions in the history of Syria by Nicholas, which, conjointly with the fragments preserved by Josephus, give the possibility of casting a glance into that portion of his large historical work. But we are also in a position to obtain some notions about other chapters and books of the same.

Josephus, in *Antiquities*, I, 7, 2, quotes the following from the fourth book of the history of Nicholas: "Abram reigned at Damascus, who, being a foreigner, came with an army out of the land above Babylon, called the land of the Chaldeans. But after a short time he removed with his people from that country and went into the land of Canaan, which is now called Judaea, where his family increased exceedingly, *περὶ ὧν ἐν ἐτέρῳ λόγῳ διέξειμι τὰ ἱστορούμενα.*" Whether the concluding phrase belongs to the fragment from Nicholas and indicates his intention of writing about Abraham, or whether they are words of Josephus<sup>1</sup>, the passage itself clearly shows that Nicholas had spoken about that patriarch in his work. Is it, perhaps, a small part from a large book on the Jews? C. Müller<sup>2</sup> attempted to reconstruct the plan of Nicholas' large work, which comprised all peoples; but he had to give it up as impossible on account of the too small number of fragments, which in many cases cannot be even characterized, especially as we have no information whatever about books 8-95. But the manner in which Nicholas divided the material of the history of a period can be recognized notwithstanding. The preserved fragments show that the first and second

<sup>1</sup> This form of reference has no parallel among those ascribed above to Nicholas; and as the others are standing formulae, this one may belong to Josephus.

<sup>2</sup> *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*, III, 345.

books dealt with the history of the Assyrians and Medes till Astyages, but the downfall of the Median kingdom was only described in the seventh. The fourth book contained the older history of the Lydians till the Heraclide kings, but the sixth book only contains its continuation till Candaules, and the seventh the further part till the downfall of the empire. The existing fragments show that in the same book other peoples were also described; therefore, as is the case with other historical books also, the narrative dealing with one people is interrupted, and taken up again only after the history of another nation during the same period had been finished. There is no need for pointing out, that with such a method of dealing with the events, references to information previously given or still to come were not only possible, but altogether indispensable. If this was the case with the rather summary information about the most ancient nations, it was still more so in the history of Syria and Rome, which was treated in detail, and, it seems, took up in Nicholas' work ten times the space occupied by the nations he had enumerated before. For every event of more or less importance was described together with all its secondary circumstances, and the names of all participating persons were severally given<sup>1</sup>; it formed a chapter of its own, as is proved by the frequent references in those portions of the *Antiquities* that were drawn from Nicholas. If Josephus had said in each section from which book of Nicholas' history he had taken it, as he did in *Antiquities*, I, 3, 6 and XII, 3, 2, we should be acquainted not only with the extent of his descriptions of Syrian events, but also with the divisions of the books, as indicated by the reference formulae of Josephus.

As to the question whether Nicholas' remark about Abraham occurred in a book on the Jews, we do not possess the slightest indications that he had given a connected description of the history of ancient Israel in the midst of that of the other nations. For, if he had,

<sup>1</sup> Vide Destinon, *Die Quellen*, p. 46, n. 1.

Josephus would certainly not have failed to refer to that part of Nicholas' work to complete or to rectify his statements. It would be rather difficult to assume that Nicholas' treatment, though known by Josephus, would have given him no opportunities to do so, especially as we learn from a comparison of the first half of the *Antiquities* with the Bible and the Jewish-Hellenistic literature, that Josephus did not here elaborate anything which he could have taken from Nicholas. The passage about Abraham formed, as Müller conjectures<sup>1</sup>, a part of his information about Damascus, equally with the description of the wars of King Adad of Damascus against David, which also occurred in the fourth book<sup>2</sup>. On the other hand, it is beyond doubt that Nicholas had devoted at least two books, the 123rd and 124th, exclusively to the history of Herod. For, in Josephus' *Antiquities*, XV—XVII, we do not meet with a single reference to other chapters, which could show that Nicholas had treated the events under Herod in the same way as those of the history of the Seleucid empire; that is to say, in separate sections, which were interrupted by the description of other non-Syrian lands and incidents. The history of Herod formed rather a consecutive and uninterrupted narrative of all that happened under this king, the minuteness of which was only called forth by the author's relations with Herod and his active participation in the events themselves, but was not based on the general plan of the whole work. Whether Nicholas had given in his work space and attention to the history of the Jews in post-biblical times up to Herod, must be deferred to a later inquiry.

In connexion with the last inquiry a second question,

<sup>1</sup> *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, III, 345, col. 2.

<sup>2</sup> The circumstance that Nicholas had not only dealt with Adad, but also with ten successors of his (*Antiquities*, VII, 5, 2), shows also with certainty that the fourth book was devoted to the history of the Damascene kingdom, although not exclusively so, for the Lydians are also dealt with in that book.

not less important for our subject, has to be dealt with, namely that of Josephus' quotations from other writings besides those of Nicholas; whether he used and excerpted such works for his *Antiquities*, in the same way as that of the latter; or, whether he perhaps borrowed the passages cited by him from some secondary source. We have already seen that on writing the *Antiquities* he had before him the comprehensive work of Nicholas of Damascus, which dealt with the history of all peoples; and that he could make use of it, not only for the history of Syria, but also for that of the other Asiatic peoples. Did he really use it for this latter purpose? In *Antiquities*, I, 3, 6 he relates as follows: "The flood and the ark are made mention of by all the writers of barbarian histories, among whom is Berosus the Chaldean; for when he is describing the circumstances of the flood, he goes on thus:— 'It is said there is still some part of this ship in Armenia, at the mountains of the Cordyaeans, and that some people carry off pieces of the bitumen, which they take away, and use as means for the averting of mischiefs.' Hieronymus the Egyptian also, who wrote the Phoenician history, and Mnaseas, and a great many more, make mention of the same. Nay, Nicholas of Damascus, in the ninety-sixth book of his history, thus relates about it:— 'There is a great mountain in Armenia, over the district of Milyas, called Baris, upon which it is reported that many who fled at the time of the deluge were saved; and that one who was carried in an ark came on shore upon the top of it; and that the remains of the timber were a long time preserved. This is perhaps the man about whom Moses, the legislator of the Jews, wrote.' " It strikes one directly that Nicholas' statement was only a reproduction of Berosus' words; but there is nothing surprising in this, because it is only a matter of course that Nicholas, when about to write the Chaldean history, made use of Berosus, "who had published a book on astronomy and on the philosophy of the Chaldeans for the use of the Greeks" (*Contra Apionem*, I, 19). There-

fore, when dealing with the flood, and mentioning Armenia, which the legend has made the seat of the tale, he may be assumed to have had regard not only to Berosus, but also such Jewish and Egyptian historical works as had been written in Greek ; and, from the juxtaposition by Josephus, I gain the impression that we have here before us the statements of other authors collected by Nicholas, which were simply copied by Josephus, one and all, just as he found them ; after which he named the author Nicholas as the last in the series<sup>1</sup>. According to his wont, he gave here also first an extract from the book used as source, quite identical with Nicholas' statement, which he then confirms by the quotation from Nicholas itself.

This assumption is strengthened also by other passages in which Josephus names Nicholas by the side of a number of older historians, and of which we also become convinced that all these had been quoted by Nicholas, and that Josephus enumerated them all by name in order to impress his pagan readers by the imposing series of ancient authors. Thus, in *Antiquities*, I, 3, 9, he says: "Now I have for witnesses, that our ancestors lived very long, all those that have written histories, both among the Greeks and barbarians<sup>2</sup>; for even Manetho, who wrote the Egyptian

<sup>1</sup> It would be of great interest to find out in what connexion Nicholas came to speak of Noah's ark. The most obvious conjecture would be that he mentioned it when treating on the great deluge in the primitive history of the human race. But this is opposed by the circumstance that Josephus observes that the passage quoted by him occurred in the ninety-sixth book of Nicholas' work, whilst the origins of the various peoples have been described in the first books. The last words in Nicholas' fragment appear to me to show that the object of the whole passage was to explain the description of the Bible, and that the other historical works were only cited as proofs. On the other hand, the word ἀποβατήριον, used by Josephus in the extract that precedes the allegations, shows that this was the motive to these observations of Nicholas. Josephus must also have found in Nicholas' work the statement that the Armenians called the spot on which the ark rested ἐπιβατήριον, as he mentions this in his extract which precedes the quotation. Did the ninety-sixth book contain a part of the history of the Jews?

<sup>2</sup> Both in the passage quoted before, and in the present one, the

history, and Berosus, the author of the Chaldean history, and Mochus, and Hestiaeus, and besides these, Hieronymus the Egyptian, who composed the Phoenician history, agree to what I here say. Hesiod also, and Hecataeus, Hellanicus, and Acusilaus, and besides, Ephorus and Nicholas relate that the ancients lived a thousand years."

Here also, as in the passage dealt with before, we find the names of Berosus and Hieronymus, to whom Nicholas is added as the last; but besides these, other famous authors of great historical works are also enumerated, such as an historian like Nicholas is sure to have made use of, when writing a work comprising an account of all peoples, whilst Josephus, when writing his *Antiquities*, could have had no motive for studying them. Again, in *Antiquities*, X, 1, 4 we read: "Berosus also, who wrote of the affairs of Chaldea, makes mention of the King Sennacherib, and that he ruled over the Assyrians, and that he made an expedition against all Asia and Egypt." This sentence is preceded by the remark that Herodotus also reported this, and by two different reports of why Sennacherib was unable to do any harm to Hezekiah and to the kingdom of Judah. Josephus, after having given the narrative contained in the Bible about this event, proceeds to give a circumstantial account of how the king of the Assyrians besieged Pelusium and how, although the high banks had already been completed, he was prevented from conquering the city because of the approach of the Ethiopian army. Since Josephus, after the second account, says at the end that Herodotus also had related the same, and points out that the latter had contra-

distinction made between Greek and barbarous authors is noteworthy, for it proves that the statement had a Greek for its author. Such distinction we also find in *Antiquities*, IV, 2, 1; VIII, 11, 3; XI, 7, 1; XVI, 6, 8; XVIII, 1, 20; *Contra Apionem*, I, 18, 22; II, 39; *Wars*, V, 1, 3; VI, 3, 3; but all these passages are Josephus' own, and he had adopted this mode of expression as a genuine Hellene. Only *Contra Apionem*, I, 22 is a fragment from pseudo-Hecataeus; for the expression used there testifies to the Egyptian origin of the author. Cf. also Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 89.

dicted himself in some detail in both descriptions, we may confidently assume that the whole passage belongs to this author, and we may further conjecture that Josephus had met with this passage, as also that of Berosus, ready at hand in his prototype Nicholas. There are two more circumstances which prove that he did not himself take from Herodotus' history either the first passage or the second fragment reproduced in the same chapter. In the first place, the second passage lay before him in such a form that he could not clearly understand its contents, but he found contradictions between details of Herodotus' account within the space of two lines; this can only be accounted for in this way, that the reports lay before him in an extract, from which the special relations to each other could no longer be made out. In the second place, the comparison of Josephus' account of Sennacherib's retreat with that of the Bible discloses another fact. Josephus, in X, 1, 4, follows closely the narrative of the Bible, 2 Kings xviii and xix, till chap. xix. ver. 29, and concludes with the words *οὐδὲν φοβουμένους*. Then he interrupts it, and takes it up again in X, 1, 5 with the words *τοῦ Θεοῦ λοιμικὴν ἐνσκήψαντος*, guided by 2 Kings xix. 35-37, the contents of which verses he reproduces. Between these two portions of the narrative there are the citations of Herodotus and Berosus, which are meant to describe the motive of Sennacherib's hurried return from Egypt, but which, in reality, say something quite different from what Josephus wanted to establish. For the Biblical narrative tells us, 2 Kings xix. 9, that Sennacherib was prevented from conquering Jerusalem because Tirhaka was marching against him. Josephus reproduces this verse in X, 1, 4. The Greek sources, on the other hand, tell of an Arabic king who besieged Pelusium, but was unable to take the city in consequence of an event which had the same effect as that described in the Bible. Josephus thought that both accounts described the same event, he therefore made use of Herodotus, with whose narrative he amplified the

Biblical account. His reason for doing so is not apparent from his description, but will be understood, if we assume that he found both passages ready at hand in Nicholas, and he sought to harmonize them with the Bible for the purpose of impressing his readers.

But there is still another passage taken from Berosus, which supports our assumption about Josephus' source. In *Antiquities*, X, 11, 1 he reproduces a comprehensive fragment from this historian; he cites, besides the Indian history of Megasthenes, the Persian of Dioeles, and the Indian and Phoenician history of Philostratus, and then proceeds: "This is all that is reported by all authors concerning this king." This sentence obviously presupposes the author's intention to communicate everything, whatever had been said, and could possibly be found, in the various histories concerning Nebuchadnezzar. But this could not have been his real intention; for Josephus collects from the Greek authors only such material as refers to the Jews and confirms the Biblical account. But, on the other hand, it is evident that Nicholas of Damascus had made use, for his work, of all the histories written by his predecessors, and all the special works on the various countries, and that he had quoted his sources by name, and that Josephus borrowed from him. Thus only it becomes intelligible why the latter commences his chapter on Nebuchadnezzar in X, 11, 1 with the words: "Now when the king had reigned forty-three years, he ended his life. He was an energetic man, and more fortunate than all his predecessors." For this there was no indication whatever either in the Bible or in the passage he quotes from Berosus, but he had borrowed it from Nicholas' description of Nebuchadnezzar's character.

A further proof of the correctness of this assumption, namely, that Josephus obtained the whole collection of ancient historians, as given in *Antiquities*, I, 3, 9, only from second-hand sources, is afforded by a comparison of the passages quoted from the same works in *Contra*



*Apionem* with those used in the *Antiquities*. For we find that Josephus, in *Antiquities*, VIII, 5, 3 and *Contra Ap.* I, 17, quotes the same passage from Dios, but for different purposes and with different words, although it is in both cases alleged that the author's words were quoted. Is it merely accidental that he quotes them twice, but not quite in the same form? We find in *Antiquities*, VIII, 5, 3, a rather larger fragment from Menander of Ephesus, who had translated the Tyrian annals, that had been written in the Phoenician language, into Greek. But we find the same passage also in *Contra Ap.* I, 18, to its full extent; and the parallel accounts again bear the same relation to each other as those previously mentioned. We see the same thing in the long description of Berosus in *Antiquities*, X, 11, 1<sup>1</sup>, which is again met with in *Contra Ap.* I, 19; both here and there the reports of the Phoenician historian and those of Megasthenes are named to confirm the statements, which proves beyond doubt that Josephus found all these authors already collected and named

<sup>1</sup> It cannot be expected that all passages quoted from Greek historians in Josephus' works should be repeated, because not all of them can be used for the purposes for which *Contra Apionem* was written, and there was consequently no motive for such repetition. Thus, in Josephus I, 7, 2, Josephus quotes Berosus as evidence in reference to Abraham: "In the tenth generation after the flood, there was among the Chaldeans a man righteous and great, and skilful in the celestial science"; which quotation does not occur again. Josephus could certainly have proved from this passage the age of the Israelite nation and Berosus' knowledge of that people, if this had spoken of Abraham at all, or if this passage had stated the least thing about Abraham. Vide Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 57. The quotation from Nicholas, which follows immediately, shows that the latter had quoted the passage, without, however, alluding to Abraham. Bloch, *Die Quellen des Josephus*, p. 64, observes rightly Berosus' influence in *Antiquities*, I, 3, 9, where Josephus says that God had given the ancient men a longer time of life in order to enable them to accomplish themselves in astrology and mathematics. But Bloch's observation finds its simple explanation in the circumstance that the whole section is nothing else but the account of the contents of a fragment from Berosus found by Josephus in Nicholas' work, and preceding the quotation itself, according to Josephus' usual method.

together, and that, when he studied them in his prototype for the second time, he borrowed them in the same way as the first time. Thus it came about that he quoted the same fragments twice, because his source did not contain anything beyond what he had already taken up in his *Antiquities*. For we meet with this mode of treatment not only in reference to Berosus and the Phoenician historians, but also in respect to Herodotus (*Antiquities*, VIII, 10, 3; *Contra Ap.* I, 22), and Agatharchides (*Antiquities*, XII, 1, 1; *Contra Ap.* I, 22), from which it is clear that he did not derive his quotations from the works of the authors themselves, but from some book in which they were quoted. Now Josephus had composed his controversy against Apion independently from the *Antiquities*, and thus it came about that the extract which he made in the latter work from Berosus and others did not quite agree with the one occurring in the other book, a circumstance which can also be observed on comparing the corresponding parts of the *Wars* and the *Antiquities*<sup>1</sup>. This is in perfect harmony with that which Niebuhr<sup>2</sup> proves from the passages from Berosus as quoted by Josephus, namely, that Josephus could not possibly have made use of that historical work, because his allegations do not look like the original description by that author, but like extracts<sup>3</sup>. According to our argument they occurred in Nicholas' work, and he did not, in all probability, reproduce them verbatim either.

It may be noticed that Josephus quotes the passages of Berosus which he repeats in *Contra Apionem*, in connexion with the Phoenician histories, and even when speaking of Nebuchadnezzar, cites from Philostratus the fact that this king had besieged the city of Tyre for thirteen years. I believe we may conclude from this, that these fragments

<sup>1</sup> Vide Destinon, *Die Quellen*, p. 10 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> *Geschichte Assurs und Babylons*, p. 13; against this, vide Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, p. 28 sqq.; Bloch, p. 63.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften*, IV, 462, 526, 562.

belonged to Nicholas' book on Phoenicia. The same work may also have contained the passages referred to by Josephus as taken from the works of Dios and Menander<sup>1</sup>; also Mochus, Hestiaeus, and the Egyptian Hieronymus, who are named as authors of Phoenician histories in *Antiquities*, I, 3, 9, may have been referred to in that work as authorities. Unfortunately, not the slightest portion of that part of Nicholas' work has come down to us, so that we are without the material necessary for the verification of our view. On the other side the extracts from Herodotus and Manetho belong to Nicholas' description of Egyptian history<sup>2</sup>, of which nothing has been preserved either, whilst a few quotations from Berosus were taken from the Chaldean history. The result of all this would be that Nicholas' comprehensive work was constantly before Josephus when writing his *Antiquities*, and that it served him as a mine from which to draw the passages from ancient writers. But whilst the first ten books of the *Antiquities* owe all their contents to the Bible, and Josephus only rarely borrowed from Nicholas, when he wished to confirm the Biblical account from statements by non-Jewish historians, he took in the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth

<sup>1</sup> Menander is also quoted in *Antiquities*, IX, 14, 2, in connexion with King Salmanassar; there Josephus cites a long piece from his chronicle, which clearly shows that he knew all these reports only from a history of the Phoenicians, where also other nations in their relation to Tyre have been shortly treated.

<sup>2</sup> In reference to this I should like to point out the following data: Josephus, in *Antiquities*, VIII, 6, 2, when mentioning Pharaoh, Solomon's father-in-law, discusses the question why all the kings of ancient Egypt were called Pharaoh. The circumstance that in this small piece Minaeos is named twice, and that Egyptian words are interpreted, makes one suppose a work about Egypt as source. Now, Herodotus is expressly named, and Josephus quotes him with the remark that all Egyptian queens had been called Nicaule. On the other hand, Josephus, in *Antiquities*, VII, 5, 2, reports from Nicholas' work: "When Hadad was dead, his posterity reigned for ten generations, each of his successors receiving from his father his dominion and his name, as did the Ptolemies in Egypt." May not Nicholas have pointed out here also the Pharaohs and the Caesars, although Josephus gives the explanation in his own name?

books of his work the whole material referring to the kingdom of the Seleucides from Nicholas' history, and filled a considerable space with it. But since the first book of the Maccabees, which is so rich in information, and some other Jewish sources, offered him material for the history of some decades of Jewish history, he intentionally divided the extent of his description between these and Nicholas of Damascus. On the other hand, the latter only is copied in books XIV—XVII of the *Antiquities*, and it is only here and there that Josephus interrupted his continuous description with information from Jewish authors.

But all these arguments and proofs would fall to the ground, if it could be proved that Josephus knew and made use of Berossus either directly from the work of that author, or from Alexander Polyhistor, and from no other source. This view was brought forward by Gutschmid<sup>1</sup>—who holds that it was likely that Josephus made use of him in either way—and by C. Müller<sup>2</sup>. In order to refute the assumption that Josephus borrowed from Alexander Polyhistor, it will suffice to produce Freudenthal's arguments which oppose this view<sup>3</sup>. He says: "Josephus expressly names Berossus, and repeats his words, as his immediate source; it is not apparent why these allegations must be false, why he should not have known his Chaldean history, in the same way as he was acquainted with Manetho's Egyptian history. That he had, besides, also read Alexander's *Chaldaica*, as appears from his quotation of the *Sibyl*, does not prove that he could not have made direct use of Berossus in other passages. If Josephus had merely copied his quotations from Berossus from Alexander, why should Eusebius cite at one time from Josephus, and another time from Alexander's extracts? Why should he, in his *Chronography*, first copy all excerpts from Alexander which refer to Nebuchadnezzar and his successors, and then

<sup>1</sup> *Kleine Schriften*, IV, 492, 495.

<sup>2</sup> *Fragmenta Histor. Graecorum*, II, 496.

<sup>3</sup> *Alexander Polyhistor*, p. 27.

place by the side of them the much more diffuse excerpta of Josephus? Does this not prove that Eusebius found in Alexander's *Chaldaica*, the source from which he drew, much missing which Josephus afforded him, and that it is therefore impossible that Josephus should have merely excerpted Alexander? And finally, it is not a small proof of Josephus' genuineness that his excerpta are always given in the *oratio recta*, but that Alexander—and consequently also Eusebius and Syncellus, whenever they report him verbatim—always gives his extracts in the *oratio obliqua*. We must therefore consider Josephus' extracts as the words of Berosus himself." These keen and subtle arguments sufficiently show that Josephus and Eusebius took their corresponding extracts from different sources, and, since it is certain that Eusebius had taken his from Alexander Polyhistor, Josephus must have drawn from another source. But it is not proved that this latter was Berosus himself. The other circumstance also, pointed out by Gutschmid, that Josephus' two lengthy passages on Nebuchadnezzar had been compressed by Alexander Polyhistor into a few words, and that they had been preserved by Eusebius in this form, only shows that Josephus had not copied Alexander, but some other epitomizer, whose extracts were much lengthier, but not necessarily that he had copied Berosus himself. Everything brought forward by Freudenthal as characteristic of Josephus' pattern, in contrast with Alexander Polyhistor, can be found in Nicholas of Damascus. The latter had, of course, made his extracts much more carefully than Alexander, and the allegation of passages from other authors in the *oratio recta* has many parallels in other quotations from Nicholas in Josephus. In fact, Josephus had made as little direct use of Manetho as of Berosus, so that this objection of Freudenthal's speaks for the excerpta not having been made directly from their works. For the rest, Freudenthal arrived himself at the conclusion that "the possibility exists, that the copy of Berosus which lay before Josephus had

already been just as much interpolated as that of Manetho, but that the revision had not been made by Polyhistor." We add: but by Nicholas.

4. *The authors quoted by name in "Antiquities" XII—XIV.*

The conclusions arrived at from the quotations out of the first part of the *Antiquities*, namely, that the quotations were taken from Nicholas' work and not from the works of the authors themselves, apply in all probability also to the historians quoted in the second part of the *Antiquities*. But the latter stood much nearer to him in point of time than the former, and it was very easy for him to obtain their works in Rome; it must therefore be first specially proved in what relations he stood to them when writing his work. We have seen that he had taken everything relating to Syria, which was not mentioned in the first book of the Maccabees, from Nicholas. The latter had doubtless made use of Polybius and Posidonius<sup>1</sup>; we must therefore try to find out, in the first instance, how Josephus is related to these two authors. Not a single point can be adduced to show with certainty that he had known Polybius from that author's own work<sup>2</sup>, for everything he quotes in the latter's name may have occurred in Nicholas' books<sup>3</sup>. In respect to Posidonius, the circumstance that

<sup>1</sup> Müller, *Fragmenta*, III, 415, frag. 79; Schürer, I, 35.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. my essay in *Revue des Études Juives*, XXXII, p. 186.

<sup>3</sup> This seems to me to be proved also by the passage in which he controverts Polybius. Namely, in *Antiquities*, XII, 9, 1, after the lengthy abstract from 1 Macc. vi. 1–16, he produces Polybius' account, according to which Antiochus IV Epiphanes died because he wanted to despoil the sanctuary of Artemis in Persia. Against this Josephus observes, that it was much more certain that Antiochus lost his life because of the spoliation of the temple of Jerusalem, which crime he had actually committed. "But I will not contend about this with those who think that the cause assigned by Polybius is nearer the truth than that assigned by me." A work must therefore have lain before Josephus in which the cause as assigned by Polybius occurred; the narrative itself must also have been there, and this may have been Josephus' source.

Josephus does not name that author in the *Antiquities* cannot be taken to prove that he had not been acquainted with the latter's important historical work, for the reason that he did not name it may have been that he had made use of it as his principal source. But the fact that he found nowhere in the *Antiquities* any opportunity of controverting or correcting a single statement of his, as is the case with Polybius and Nicholas, and that, in his book *Contra Apionem*, he exhibits no direct knowledge of that author's attacks against Judaism—although both Strabo and Diodorus had taken them over from Posidonius—this fact shows that Josephus had not known his book, and also that Nicholas had not quoted it by name, because it served the latter for the principal source for those Syrian events which were reported by Josephus<sup>1</sup>. Josephus would otherwise have made use of the opportunity afforded him, either in his description of the pollution of the temple by Antiochus, or on dwelling on the counsels given by Antiochus VII Sidetes, in *Antiquities*, XIII, 8, 3, to discuss Posidonius' odious attacks, in the same way as he discussed in the book *Contra Apionem* those made by other authors.

But the most important point seems to me this: to decide whether Josephus made use of Strabo's account by the side of the parallel description of Nicholas of Damascus, or whether he found it also in Nicholas' work—not at all an impossible thing. This doubt is the more justified, in as far as Strabo is quoted in those very portions of the *Antiquities* in which Nicholas' Syrian and Roman history has served as source—quoted, indeed, more frequently than Nicholas himself. Let us consider one of the passages in which Josephus points out the complete unanimity of these two historians. He says in *Antiquities*, XIV, 6, 4: "Now Nicholas of Damascus, and Strabo of Cappadocia, both describe the expeditions of Pompey and Gabinius against the Jews, while neither of them says anything new which is not in the other." It might have

<sup>1</sup> Vide Bloch, *Die Quellen des Josephus*, p. 94, n. 4; Destinon, p. 53.

been expected accordingly that neither of these two authors would have been mentioned by name in Josephus' account of these events (*Antiquities*, XIV, 2, 3-6, 4), since he followed the unanimous narrative of both. But in XIV, 3, 1 he produces a fragment from Strabo, in which it is related that Pompey received in Damascus a costly present from a Jewish embassy, without bearing in mind that he related Pompey's arrival at Damascus in a subsequent passage only, and that order of relation was quite incongruous. The subsequent narrative, however, runs on without any interruption; it is therefore clear that Strabo's fragment did not occur in Nicholas, his principal authority, but that Josephus had found it somewhere else, and inserted it in a place by no means suitable for it. Josephus gives, in the same way, in *Antiquities*, XIV, 8, 3, two fragments of Strabo which deal with Caesar's Alexandrine wars; but they are inserted only in the passage in which Caesar's presence in Syria, after the completion of the war, is being related. Besides, Josephus did not notice at all that neither account of Strabo's agreed with the description given by him in *Antiquities*, XIV, 8, 1; for whilst Strabo's fragment mentions Hyrcanus' presence in Egypt, this latter incident is impossible if Josephus' account, that Hyrcanus' ambassadors presented letters, is true<sup>1</sup>. It is therefore beyond doubt that Josephus added these fragments of Strabo subsequently, after he had embodied in his work an extract from Nicholas' description<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Vide Niese in *Hermes*, XI, 470.

<sup>2</sup> Strabo was a very conscientious scholar, and he always quotes his authorities (cf. Schürer, I, 39); Josephus copied the latter from Strabo whenever they referred to the Jews, e.g. *Antiquities*, XIV, 8, 3, he quotes Asinius Pollio, and XIII, 11, 3 and 12, 5, Timagenes. These references show that Strabo had also taken notice of Roman authors; I believe, therefore, that Josephus had also copied from Strabo the only passage he quotes from Livy in *Antiquities*, XIV, 4, 3: "That this is the real truth, I appeal to those that have written of the acts of Pompey; and among them to Strabo and Nicholas of Damascus; and besides these to Titus Livy, the writer of the Roman history." It is true, Josephus could have



A comparison between *Antiquities*, XIV, 16, 4 and XV, 1, 2 would lead to the same result. In both passages the execution of the King Antigonus by Antonius is related, but they differ as to details. In the former we read that the reason why Herod had induced Antonius to kill Antigonus was, because he feared that the latter might be spared by Antonius, and be brought to Rome for the purpose of accounting to the senate for his actions, in which case it might have been possible that he would be re-instated as king on account of his noble descent. But in the other passage he reports from Strabo: "Antony ordered Antigonus the Jew to be brought to Antioch, and there to be beheaded, as supposing he could no other way bend the minds of the Jews so as to receive Herod, whom he had made king in his stead." Although the first account is most probably not taken from Nicholas<sup>1</sup>, it shows nevertheless that Strabo's fragment was inserted only subsequently, after Josephus had already narrated Antigonus' death. This method is still more obvious in *Antiquities*, XIV, 7, 2, where Josephus makes a digression about the wealth of the sanctuary of Jerusalem, in connexion with his narrative of the spoliation of that temple by Crassus, and quotes in evidence two passages from Strabo. One of them is without doubt taken from the latter's description of the war of Mithridates, and has nothing whatever to do with the narrative into which it was thrust in by Josephus. The other belongs, as we learn from Josephus' remark, to the description of the revolt of the Jews of Cyrene, which Sulla despatched Lucullus to quench; and it is impossible to see what motive Josephus had to insert that passage there, unless it was a desire to preserve everything that Strabo had written about the Jews<sup>2</sup>. All these fragments

read Livy in Rome, and he might have quoted him for the purpose of showing the Romans from their own great historian how thoroughly he had treated his subject; but there was no special motive to do so.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Destinon, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*, p. 107.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Destinon, p. 106, n. 2.

show therefore, for certain, that Josephus had not copied Strabo from Nicholas <sup>1</sup>.

But these passages refer, all of them, to Roman history, no certain proof can therefore be derived from them in respect to the fragments quoted by Josephus from Strabo on Syrian history. In regard to the latter, we shall also start our observations with a passage in which Josephus records Strabo's unanimity with Nicholas. He says in *Antiquities*, XIII, 12, 6: "Both Strabo and Nicholas affirm that Ptolemy used the Jews after this manner, as I also have declared." To which of the two does the preceding description belong? As it is a matter of course that Strabo had not only described the termination of the war, but also all the incidents connected therewith, it is possible that the whole description as given by Josephus was borrowed from that author. We may conclude for certain that

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Schürer, I, 39. Another passage has to be considered here also. Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, II, 7, says as follows: "But for Antiochus Epiphanes, he had no just cause for that ravage in our temple that he made; he only came to it because he wanted money, without declaring himself our enemy, and attacked us while we were his associates and friends; nor did he find anything there that was ridiculous. This is attested by many worthy writers: Polybius of Megalopolis, Strabo of Cappadocia, Nicholas of Damascus, Timagenes, Castor the Chronologer, and Apollodorus, who all say that it was out of Antiochus' want of money that he broke his league with the Jews, and despoiled their temple when it was full of gold and silver." The question arises here how Josephus came to know these authors and their accounts. Since Nicholas is named, we may assume that the information afforded by Polybius occurred in his work, in the same way as in the instances discussed above, although it may also have been reproduced by Strabo. Timagenes, we have just seen, was quoted by Strabo; there only remain Castor and Apollodorus, who, without doubt, were quoted either by Nicholas or by Strabo. No decision can be given (vide Schürer, I, 55 sqq.). The order in which Josephus names the authors, and which is dictated by no principle whatever, cannot be adduced in proof of the connexion of the authors with one another. It can only be explained in this way, that Josephus had found a reference to Castor in one of his authorities, and to Apollodorus in another; or that Josephus' authority first discussed the one and then the other, which induced him to conceive the erroneous notion that they were quoted according to the age in which they lived.

Josephus was acquainted with Strabo's account from XIII, 10, 4, where he quotes Strabo's words: "The greater part, both those that came to Cyprus with Ptolemy, and those that were sent afterward thither, revolted to Ptolemy immediately; only those that were called Onias' party, being Jews, continued faithful, because their countrymen, Chelkias and Ananias, were in chief favour with the queen." *Antiquities*, XIV, 7, 2 also attests that Josephus knew and made use of Strabo's description of the war between Cleopatra and Ptolemy. In XIII, 12, 5 the number is given of the Jews that fell in the struggle against Ptolemy; there were thirty thousand; according to Timagenes fifty thousand; on the other hand, we learn from XIII, 11, 3: *μαρτυρεῖ τοῦτο καὶ Στράβων ἐκ τοῦ Τιμαγένους ὀνόματος λέγων οὕτως*, that Josephus knew Timagenes through Strabo, so that it may be assumed that the whole passage had been taken from Strabo; especially so, as Strabo is named in the same connexion a few lines lower<sup>1</sup>. To the same source we shall then have to ascribe also the other passage quoted in exactly the same manner as Timagenes, of the *ἐνιοὶ συγγραφεῖς*, who give a number different from that of the main description, and under which designation he most likely understands Timagenes himself. As Josephus names this author and not Strabo, we might be led to assume that we have here Strabo's original account, as we have elsewhere that of Nicholas, and that it extended from XIII, 12, 2 to 13, 3. But against this we have Josephus' remark that Nicholas and Strabo had written about it, whereas, if our last assumption were true, he had only made use of the latter's description. But if we call to memory the result arrived at from the previous consideration of the fragments from Strabo, namely, that the description, without any mention being made of the author's name, was borrowed from Nicholas, to which Josephus subsequently added his extracts from Strabo, everything becomes clear. The description of the war between Ptolemy and Cleopatra,

<sup>1</sup> Vide Schürer, I, 37 and 64.

from the beginning to the end, like all the sections referring to Syria, belong to Nicholas. Only after he had embodied them in the *Antiquities*, he compared them with Strabo, and whenever he found a discrepancy to exist between his first authority and the latter, he recorded it in the text. But in Strabo he found the account given in the name of Timagenes, he therefore communicates it under the same name, for the purpose of making prominent the great antiquity of his sources and the reliance that his accounts deserved. *Antiquities*, XIII, 10, 4 also proves that in this part of the work in which Syrian history is taken notice of, Strabo was inserted only subsequently, in the same way in which it was done in the history of the Roman age. For in that passage Josephus gives a fragment from Strabo, in which mention is made of the faithlessness of Cleopatra's soldiers and the loyalty of the Jews during the war of that queen against her son Ptolemy. It is inserted there among matter that has no real connexion with the contents of the fragment, and, in fact, interrupts the flow of the narrative. It seems that Josephus had first finished his description of the events under John Hyrcan, and subsequently looked for a place where to insert Strabo's report.

The result of this inquiry is therefore that Josephus had borrowed the whole material of the first seventeen books of his *Antiquities* from Nicholas of Damascus, except those data which were taken from the Bible, the letter of Aristaeas, the first book of the Maccabees, and some other source that dealt with the high priests. From the same comprehensive work, which contained the history of all peoples, he took also the references to such authors as are quoted by name, and the passages cited from their works, with the exception of Strabo. The very formulae used in referring to a history of Syria are Nicholas' property. Josephus had however, as we have seen, only sparingly used those portions which bear upon the ancient peoples, because Nicholas had touched upon a few points

of contact only between those peoples and the Jews. On the other hand, Josephus has made ample use of the description devoted to the kingdom of the Seleucides, because there had been intimate relations between Jews and Syrians for a period of two centuries. This portion of Nicholas' work having engaged our attention in the first instance, it would be interesting to learn the nature and compass of this prototype of the *Antiquities*. It would not be difficult to form a judgment on the character of the work from the numerous fragments contained in Josephus, for their compressed form points to a detailed description, and they must therefore be considered as abbreviated excerpts, and not as verbatim copies. The original must consequently have been comprehensive and exhaustive, and rich in references. This last must have been particularly the case in those books that were devoted to the history of ancient peoples. But in the Syrian history Polybius and Posidonius were the principal authorities, and their names are only given when the different opinions of other authors are contrasted with theirs. It is difficult to establish the point from which Nicholas started his history of the Syrian kingdom; the most appropriate point of issue was evidently the death of Alexander the Great and the war of the *diadochi*, and the history concluded with the annihilation of the rule of the Seleucides by the Romans. Natural and plausible as this assumption in reference to a work on universal history may be, it is subverted by the remarkable fact that Josephus was not able to produce, for the whole period from Alexander till Antiochus Epiphanes, any material except such as he had taken from Jewish-Hellenistic works, and which was of little historical value. If he had found in Nicholas' work any information, however indirect, about the events connected with the Jews of Palestine, he would have made ample use of it, especially in the absence of information from Jewish source; he would have utilized it, in the same way as he gave, in the thirteenth book of his

*Antiquities*, detailed descriptions of Syrian events, although these latter often had no connexion with the Jews. There is only one way out of this difficulty, namely, to compare the authors referred to in the *Antiquities* and those quoted in the book against Apion, whose names were taken from Nicholas' work.

Such comparison makes us acquainted with two distinct facts. In the first place, we learn that in the book *Contra Apionem* neither Nicholas, nor Strabo, nor Polybius, nor Posidonius is quoted, but only such historians as are not generally known, with the exception of the single passage about Antiochus in II, 7, in which they are all mentioned, with the addition of Apollodorus and Castor. Secondly, from the time of the *diadochi* till Antiochus the Great, Polybius is only named once in *Antiquities*, XII, 4, 2; besides, Agatharchides is mentioned in both books in reference to the conquest of Jerusalem by Ptolemy I, and the fact that Josephus refers to his history of the *diadochi* shows that he had found it quoted by Nicholas. Nevertheless, these scanty data are not of sufficient weight for the assumption that Nicholas had described that period. It appears rather, and this is confirmed by the first fact, that Nicholas had, like Polybius, commenced his descriptions of the kingdom of the Seleucides with Antiochus the Great<sup>1</sup>, but that he had treated the history of the preceding kings only very briefly and summarily. Otherwise it would be incomprehensible why Josephus should have been able, from information given by Castor, to fix so accurately in the book *Contra Apionem*, I, 22, the time of Alexander's death, and of the battle of Gaza, in which Ptolemy the son of Lagus defeated Demetrius Poliorketes, or to refer in the *Antiquities*, X, 8, 1, with his usual reference formula, to a history of Philippos and Alexander of Macedonia, and yet not to name a single one of these authors for the subsequent times. And even that which he quotes in

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Stark, *Gaza und die philistäische Küste*, p. 336 sqq.

several passages of his work against Apion from Pseudo-Hecataeus belongs to the period of Alexander and Ptolemy the First, as the genuine Hecataeus, who is quoted by Josephus in *Antiquities*, I, 3, 9, among the large number of authors who testified to the longevity of the patriarchs, but who otherwise seems to have been unknown to him<sup>1</sup>, also was a contemporary of Ptolemy, the son of Lagus<sup>2</sup>.

But it is possible, although not very probable, that the same incident is common to the eleventh book of the *Antiquities*, and to XII, 5, 3—XIII, 7 of the same work, namely, that the information taken from the first book of the Maccabees took the place of almost everything that Nicholas had said about the relations between the Jews and the Seleucides. Josephus' object was to give the heathens a description of the greatness of his fathers. But the latter was much more amply exhibited, and illustrated by many more details, in the first book of the Maccabees than in the work of Nicholas, who, as the fragments show, hardly mentions the deeds performed by the Jews. For the period from Alexander till Antiochus the Great also, Josephus found the description of Jewish history, as given by the Jewish Hellenists, quite sufficient for the object he had in view, and even going beyond it. He therefore disregarded Nicholas and kept to the former, but he failed to notice that he neglected Judaea entirely, and transferred the central point of his history to Alexandria and the court of the Ptolemies. This assumption is, for all that, improbable; for in the *Antiquities* from XII, 5, 3 to XIII, 7, in spite of the servile adherence to the first book of the Maccabees, a good many sentences have been

<sup>1</sup> He nowhere betrays any knowledge of the fragment preserved by Diodorus, XL, 3. If he had known it, he would not have omitted to controvert the statements contained in the latter as to the residence of the Jews in Egypt and their exodus from that country. I believe—in spite of Willrich's remarks, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 51—with Schürer, II, 818, that the supposititious work of Hecataeus is based also upon passages from the real Hecataeus.

<sup>2</sup> Schürer, II, 816; *Contra Apionem*, I, 22.

taken from Nicholas' Syrian history, whereas we do not find the long gap from Ptolemy the son of Lagus till Antiochus the Great interrupted by a single event from the universal history of Syria and Egypt. If there had been a history by Nicholas or if Josephus had read Strabo's work, he would have found there many remarks about that period.

ADOLF BÜCHLER.